

Proposal Reviews

#10: Banta Carbona Irrigation District Fish Screen Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Banta Carbona Irrigation District

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Delta Regional Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding #1
#2

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Proposal Number: 10

Applicant Organization: Banta Carbona Irrigation District

Proposal Title: Banta Carbona Irrigation District Fish Screen Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	This is an important project benefiting fisheries and overall restoration on the mainstem San Joaquin, Merced, Tuolumne Rivers, and others. The project construction will be complete in fall 2002 and post construction hydraulic and biological evaluations are needed.
-Above average	This proposal, however, covers more than biological monitoring. Some tasks, such as those related to project management, construction management and O&M, are not relevant to post construction monitoring and should not be considered in this proposal. The scope of costs associated with monitoring appears very high, particularly in the first year. Further justification of costs is warranted.
-Adequate	Although not recommended as written, this proposal could still be considered for funding if the monitoring plan is revised to reflect agency concerns. In addition, CALFED should explore additional funding to expand this evaluation and fully capture opportunities to learn how BCIDs fish bypass technologies may be applicable to state and federal pumps and other Delta diversions. This significant opportunity to use the evaluation of BCIDs screens to inform decisions about potential Delta facilities should be more thoroughly explored. It responds directly to a significant PSP priority (DR-7 Protect at risk species in Delta with water management + regulatory approaches/Minimize effects of diversions on fish), applying adaptive management principles to CALFED-supported fish screen projects.
XNot recommended	

1. **Location in terms of potential impact on fishery.** Is the project located where it will significantly benefit the fishery? Do current fish passage barriers or water diversions there harm large numbers of fish? What species of anadromous fish are present? Is the project located where these species are in their most vulnerable life stages? Will it benefit other species of fish or the waterway's community and ecosystem? Does it restore and protect natural habitats or habitat values? Will its benefits be long-term, or short-lived? Is its biological effectiveness clearly demonstrable?

The project would have significant benefits to fisheries. The species at risk are predominantly fall-run Chinook salmon. Spring-run Chinook are apparently scarce and winter-run absent from the San Joaquin River system. Splittail and Delta smelt may be present at certain times. The project is currently under construction and will be completed in fall of 2002. Hydraulic and biological monitoring could occur soon afterwards.

2. **Diversions taking a greater proportion of flow.** If the project is a fish screen, is the size of the diversion to be screened a significant proportion of the waterway's discharge?

The diversion is for roughly 250 cfs, which could be a significant proportion of the San Joaquin River in summer months.

3. **Implementability** (minimal legal, regulatory or technical obstacles): Does the project use proven and existing technology, or unproven and experimental technology? Can it be implemented in a timely fashion, or are protracted delays anticipated? Are project partners, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Will legal, regulatory, or technical obstacles impede it? Can any adverse effects be reversed or adequately mitigated? Does it enjoy public support? Is it compatible with other programs and projects, which are part of an integrated restoration program for the waterway? Does it have synergistic effects with ongoing programs?

The project is highly implementable. The project has regulatory agency and landowner support. The project is compatible with CALFED ERP and CVPIA programs and goals for fisheries restoration. The project construction is underway.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The basis of the costs for the proposed fish screen monitoring and evaluations are difficult to determine from the information presented in the proposal. Costs for project management, construction management, O&M manual preparation and hydraulic evaluations appear very high and not pertinent to the monitoring needed for this project. These tasks should be part of previously funded phases. The biological monitoring also appears high for the first year. Subsequent year costs for biological monitoring appear reasonable.

5. **Partnerships/Opportunities.** Does the project fully involve appropriate partners? Are the applicants willing participants? Are other cost-sharing funds available, and fully exploited?

Applicant is a willing participant. They have received CALFED, CVPIA, DFG and other cost share funding for the project. Applicant is now requesting CALFED funds for the facilities monitoring and evaluations.

6. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

The regional panel gave this proposal a Medium ranking. The application needs more detail and justification for those tasks outlined in the study.

7. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

No

Miscellaneous comments:

Some tasks and costs appear to be unrelated to monitoring and evaluation. See comment 4.

BCIDs screens incorporate new fish bypass technology that may be applicable to new fish screen facilities at the state + federal Delta pumps. The panel feels that post-construction evaluation + monitoring of BCIDs facility may provide a special opportunity to assess the efficacy of this technology and to learn more about its potential application to the state + federal Delta pumps + other Delta diversions. This opportunity isnt, however, addressed adequately by the evaluation plan BCID submitted.

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 10

Proposal Title: Banta Carbona Irrigation District Fish Screen Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Overall Ranking: -Low **XMedium** -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

This project needs to get done eventually and has no fatal flaws. Fish monitoring plan needs attention.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

NEPA and CEQA compliance is completed as well as other required permits such as Section 10 ESA compliance and streambed alteration permits. This request for next-phase funding is for three tasks a post construction performance evaluation, a fisheries monitoring plan, and a long-term operations and maintenance plan. Construction, which is currently under way, must be completed for commencement. Project may be delayed due to construction delays as has occurred in the past.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

Ecosystem Restoration Program Strategic Goals The primary goal addressed by this program is the protection of at-risk-species assisting in their recovery (Goal 1). The additional protection will hopefully prevent future listing of non-listed species and promote recovery of listed species. This project is also remotely related to Goal 4, which is the protection and restoration of habitat function.

Regional Implementation Priorities Delta and Eastside Tributaries. The protection of at risk species on the San Joaquin River is related to DR-1. DR-1 seeks to restore habitat corridors in the North Delta, East Delta, and San Joaquin River.

CVPIA Priorities This project relates to 3406(b)(21) which requires the assistance of the State of California in efforts to develop and implement measures to avoid losses of juvenile anadromous fish resulting from screened or unscreened diversions. This project also relates to 3402(a), which protects, restores, and enhances fish and wildlife and associated habitats. The proposal indicates that there will be a spring and winter run salmon benefit by the prevention of entrainment and predation. Spring run are scarce and winter run chinook are absent from the San Joaquin River system. Also relates to 3406(b)(1) which authorizes the AFRP to make all reasonable efforts to double anadromous fish by 2002.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

Though this project is independently pursuing local fisheries protection, the benefits of many restoration projects on the mainstem San Joaquin, Merced, and Tuolumne Rivers will be positive. This project will help protect migrating juvenile salmon, primarily fall run, as they migrate towards the Delta and Bay. If mortality estimates are effectively achieved, the information could also be useful for conceptual models.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

The principal investigators appear to have informed local governments and landowners and have been involved with the USFWS, USBR, CDFG and CALFED during the planning stages. No evidence of communication with other related groups such as the UC Davis treadmill group or the IEP Facilities Review Team was found.

Other Comments:

Poor map of site included with proposal.

I found it very difficult to follow the fish monitoring plan. The application needs more detail and justification for the design of the monitoring study. For example, why only sample for predators for three days? How will they be sampled? Predator dynamics change daily and seasonally and should be tested much more frequently. I recommend a review team with local fisheries experts for the study design of the fisheries monitoring.

Is there a long-term monitoring plan associated with this structure? It was mentioned several times in the text but not included in the performance measures.

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 10

Applicant Organization: Banta Carbona Irrigation District

Proposal Title: Banta Carbona Irrigation District Fish Screen Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The committee reviewed this proposal and ranked it as a high priority for the San Joaquin region. The implementation of the Banta-Carbona fish screen is a priority objective for the San Joaquin region as listed in the PSP regional priorities.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Project is a continuing phase funding proposal, construction already underway for the project, permits and CEQA/NEPA completed. Funding for final construction, management, testing and evaluation of completed fish screen facility. Construction timetable dependent on weather and flooding conditions at screen site; may either speed up or delay construction rate. Proponent has already communicated with local parties concerning the fish screen facility. Proponent of the project owns all of the land that will be affected by the project.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

Project addresses the following restoration priorities: Strategic Goal #1 (at risk species), #4 (habitats); Delta Region DR#1 (Protect at risk species in the delta using water management and regulatory approaches); San Joaquin Region SJ#3 (fish screens) and CVPIA (improving habitat for anadromous fish, reducing entrainment of juveniles, improving opportunities for adult fish to reach spawning grounds).

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

Enhances downstream migration success of juvenile fish from all 3 major upstream salmon spawning tribs to the San Joaquin. Thus, the screening increases the relative effectiveness of habitat restoration by increasing the % of surviving outmigrants by not entraining them. Information about design efficiency and biological effectiveness can be used for other screen projects.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

Involves local agencies (CDFG, NMFS, USFWS) in design of screens, open forums with local landowners (ag. water users) and governments. No real outreach program to local stakeholders or watershed groups at this time.

Other Comments:

Project is important for protecting downstream emigrants from the San Joaquin river and its tributaries. Facility is below all 3 major salmon spawning tribs and thus entrainment of all 3 trib runs are possible if irrigation facility is not screened effectively.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 10

New Proposal Title: Banta Carbona Irrigation District Fish Screen Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

#6FG2013960

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

#5FG2012940, #6FG2013960

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Construction of this project will be completed by summer 2002. Biological monitoring and post construction evaluations could commence soon afterwards in 2002.

Other Comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 10

New Proposal Title: Banta Carbona Irrigation District Fish Screen Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

97-MO7 Banta-Carbona Fish Screen MWD/BCID Agreement No. 27855

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 10

Applicant Organization: Banta Carbona Irrigation District

Proposal Title: Banta Carbona Irrigation District Fish Screen Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

It appears as if funding was only allocated for permitting for the construction phase but not for biological monitoring permits (e.g. a 2081 for Delta smelt).

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

It appears that all permitting is either completed or in the process of being completed.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 10

Applicant Organization: Banta Carbona Irrigation District

Proposal Title: Banta Carbona Irrigation District Fish Screen Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

17a is \$510,000 with Banta Carbona ID contributing \$93,231 (estimated). The Budget Summary Grand Total is \$550,000. No other cost share funds identified.

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: